

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.weylo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/733,866	12/11/2003	Daron Chris Hill	19075 (27839-1272)	8069	
45736 Christopher M.	7590 05/21/201 Goff (27839)	/21/2010 EXAMINER			
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP			ENGLAND, DAVID E		
ONE METROP SUITE 2600	OLITAN SQUARE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ST. LOUIS, MO	0 63102		2443		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USpatents@armstrongteasdale.com

## Interview Summary

 Application No.
 Applicant(s)

 10/733,866
 HILL ET AL.

 Examiner
 Art Unit

 DAVID E. ENGLAND
 2443

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):  (1) DAVID E. ENGLAND.  (3) Shen Wang.  (2) Kevin Jones Reg. No. 56809.  (4)		Examiner	Art Unit	
(1) DAVID E. ENGLAND.  (2) Kevin Jones Reg. No. 56809.  Date of Interview: 17 May 2010.  Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]  Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  If Yes, brief description: ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]  Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 16.  Identification of prior art discussed: Yogl.  Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's Attorney, Kevin Jones, contacted the Examiner to discuss claim amendments to further prosecution. The Attorney wished to amend the last limitation in claim 1 to state 'adulting instead of 'applying'. The Examiner stated, that in the broadest interpretation, when one applies a new value to the invention it can still be interpreted as adjusting and there is still no real patentable difference. The Attorney then stated that they wished to state that the bandwidth was being changed from one distinct value to another. The Examiner stated that there is no difference and that it would be in the Applicant's best interest to amend the claims to state how this new second value is derived since the process of deriving the value Might further prosecution, as long as it is different than what is already claimed and in the specification. No claim language was specifically agreed upon. Examiner awaits for Applicant's official response.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims to state how the interest of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims to state how the process of derivi		DAVID E. ENGLAND	2443	
(2) Kevin Jones Reg. No. 56809.  (3) Date of Interview: 17 May 2010.  Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b ☐ Video Conference o ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]  Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No. If Yes, brief description:  Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 16.  Identification of prior art discussed: Yog!.  Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's Attorney, Kevin Jones, contacted the Examiner to discuss claim amendments to further prosecution. The Attorney wished to amend the last limitation in claim 1 to state valuating' instead of 'applying'. The Examiner stated, that in the broadest interpretation, when one applies a new value to the invention it can still be interpreted as adjusting and there is still no real patentable difference. The Attorney then stated that they wished to attach that the bandwidth was being changed from one distinct value to another. The Examiner stated that their is no difference and that it would be in the Applicant's best interest to another. The Examiner stated that their is already claimed and in the specification. No claim language was specifically agreed upon. Examiner awaits for Applicant's official response.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE INTERVIEW SUBMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TEFILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SUBMARY FO	All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO	personnel):		
Date of Interview: 17 May 2010.  Type: a)  Telephonic b)  Video Conference c)  Personal (copy given to: 1)  applicant 2)  applicant's representative]  Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)  Yes e)  No.  If Yes, brief description:	(1) <u>DAVID E. ENGLAND</u> .	(3)Shen Wang.		
Type: a) Telephonic by Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]  Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description:	(2) Kevin Jones Reg. No. 56809.	(4)		
c) Personal (copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]  Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description:	Date of Interview: <u>17 May 2010</u> .			
If Yes, brief description:  Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 16.  Identification of prior art discussed: Yogl.  Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's Attorney, Kevin Jones, contacted the Examiner to discuss claim amendments to further prosecution. The Attorney wished to amend the last limitation in claim 1 to state failusting' instead of applying. The Examiner stated that in the broadest interpretation, when one applies a new value to the invention it can still be interpreted as adjusting and there is still no real patentable difference. The Attorney then stated that there is no difference and that it would be in the Applicant's best interest to another. The Examiner stated that there is no difference and that it would be in the Applicant's best interest to amonthe is a lite state how this new second value is derived since the process of deriving the value Might further prosecution, as long as it is different than what is already claimed and in the specification. No claim language was specifically agreed upon. Examiner awaits for Applicant's official response.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claim allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. The interview is a second and the proof of the amendment which		2)☐ applicant's representative	e]	
Identification of prior art discussed: Vogl.  Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) NA.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's Attorney, Kevin Jones, contacted the Examiner to discuss claims amendments to further prosecution. The Attorney wished to amend the last limitation in claim 1 to state 'adjusting' instead of 'applying'. The Examiner stated, that in the broadest interpretation, when one applies a new value to the invention it can still be interpreted as adjusting and there is still no real patentable difference. The Attorney then stated that they wished to state that the bandwidth was being changed from one distinct value to another. The Examiner stated that there is no difference and that it would be in the Applicant's best interest to amend the claims to state how this new second value is derived since the process of deriving the value finds truther procession as it is different than what is already claimed and in the specification. No claim language was specifically agreed upon. Examiner awaits for Applicant's official response.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed. APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABL		e)⊠ No.		
Agreement with respect to the claims for was reached. g) was not reached. h) \( \subseteq N/A.\)  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: \( \lambda \) policing \( \lambda \) times, \( \lambda \) contacted the \( \lambda \) xample of the discuss claims amendments to \( \lambda \) to \( \lambda \) the \( \lambda \) the \( \lambda \) to \( \lambda \) the \( \lambda \) to \( \lambda \) the \( \lambda \)	Claim(s) discussed: <u>1 and 16</u> .			
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's Attorney, Kevin Jones, contacted the Examiner to discuss claim amendments to further prosecution. The Attorney wished to amend the last limitation in claim 1 to state 'adjusting' instead of 'applying'. The Examiner stated, that in the broadest interpretation, when one applies a new value to the invention it can still be interpreted as adjusting and there is still no real patentable difference. The Attorney then stated that they wished to state that the bandwidth was being changed from one distinct value to another. The Examiner stated that there is no difference and that it would be in the Applicant's best interest to amend the claims to state how this new second value is derived since the process of deriving the value Might further prosecution, as long as it is different than what is already claimed and in the specification. No claim language was specifically agreed upon. Examiner awaits for Applicant's official response.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW. (See MEPE Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview.	Identification of prior art discussed: <u>Vogl</u> .			
reached, or any other comments: Applicant's Attorney, Kevin Jones, contacted the Examiner to discuss claim amendments to further prosecution. The Attorney wished to amend the last limitation in claim 1 to state adjusting' instead of applying'. The Examiner stated, that in the broadest interpretation, when one applies a new value to the invention it can still be interpreted as adjusting and there is still no real patentable difference. The Attorney then stated that they wished to state that the bandwidth was being changed from one distinct value to another. The Examiner stated that there is no difference and that it would be in the Applicant's best interest to amend the claims to state how this new second value is derived since the process of deriving the value find further the secution, as long as it is different than what is already claimed and in the specification. No claim language was specifically agreed upon. Examiner awaits for Applicant's official response.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DAMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE REVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE SUBSTANCE OF SUBST	Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g	)⊠ was not reached. h)□ N	I/A.	
/David E. England/ Primary Examinor, Art Unit 2443	reached, or any other comments: Applicant's Attorney. Key amendments to further prosecution. The Attorney wished to instead of applying'. The Examiner stated, that in the broad invention it can still be interpreted as adjusting and there is stated that they wished to state that the bandwidth was bet Examiner stated that there is no difference and that it would state how this new second value is derived since the process it is different than what is already claimed and in the spay upon. Examiner awaits for Applicant's official response.  A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amend allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no callowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached. THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE A THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE A THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE A THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE A THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW DATE. OR THE MALLING DATE OF THE INTERVIEW AS THE MALLING DATE OF THE INTERVIEW DATE. OR THE MALLING DAT	vin Jones, contacted the Exam o amend the last limitation in a dest interpretation, when one is still no real patentable differe in the Applicant's best int so of deriving the value Might so federiving the value Might soffered in the Applicant's best int properties of the source of iments which the examiner agropy of the amendments that which the examiner agropy of the amendments that last Office action has already OF ONE MONTH OR THIRT!	iner to discuss a claim 1 to state 's claim 1 to state 's nee. The Attorne value to another erest to amend in further prosecutives was specifically reed would render ould render the substance (substance) substance (substance) substance (substance) was specifically reed would render ould render the substance (substance) was specifically read would render ould render the substance (substance) was specifically	elaim diusting' dius to the by then The the claims to ion, as long agreed  er the claims claims  OF THE LICANT IS "HIS LATER, TC

### Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-of-Jace, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application where or not an agreement with the examiner was rescated at the interview.

# Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant of the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal Interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate. the Form should be mailed ormountly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the interview Summay Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

- A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:
- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the
- Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
  - (The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully
    - describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

#### **Examiner to Check for Accuracy**

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.